



VOL. II.

PORTLAND, OREGON, SUNDAY, JUNE 21, 1906.

Soc. Geschichte  
Amerika

No. 20.

## THE FIREBRAND

Published Weekly. Communicate in any of the European languages.  
**50 CENTS A YEAR.**

Address communications and make money orders payable  
to "The Firebrand", Box 477.

Admitted as second-class matter at Portland, Oregon.

### The Alarm.

[AIR: MAREILLELAIRE.]

WORKERS! the day is drawing near  
When Liberty in mist shall wake,  
And from the clouds of woe, grown drearer,  
The flash of battle, storm-like, break!  
Too long in empty tears and moanings  
Have toilers sat and suffered sore,  
But soon shall burst the cannon's roar,  
And weepings soon give place to groanings!

On! on! The fight must be  
For life and liberty!  
From want and woe, onward we go  
To joy and Anarchy!

While Property our weal must under,  
And each must have one measured share,  
Small wonder some should seek to plunder,  
And others die of want and care!

On every side see plenty growing—  
The more it grows the less we taste,  
And while our products run to waste  
Our misery goes overflowing.

While day by day you yield to masters  
For measured pittance, endless toil,  
And feel forever fresh disasters

While they at ease possess the spoil,  
They, trembling at your sad complaining,  
No more, in fraud, pretend to yield,  
But seek the gory battle field,  
That terror may renew their reigning.

Ay! these our tyrants, now conspiring,  
Know well the very worm will turn,  
And—with our wealth—base slaves go hiring  
To kill the slaves they fear while spurn.  
Of those their State they'd fain be ridding,  
Whose self-earned food they hold too dear,  
That those they need new wealth to rear  
May crouch in fear to do their bidding.

And shall we sink and suffer longer,  
Afraid, ashamed our rights to take?  
United, are we not the stronger,  
And shall we not our letters break?  
Up! up! the storm that gather o'er us,  
Shall purge the land from sea to sea,  
Till life is peace and man is free—  
All laws and tyrants fled before us!

Then—then, no law shall threat or bind us,  
No property our wealth divide,  
No gods and no religion bind us,  
But, free, we'll flourish side by side—  
Ay! hand in hand, through toil and leisure,  
All helpful to the common good  
Of man's triumphant Brotherhood,  
Whose labor shall be each one's pleasure!

J. A. ANDREWS.

### Communism the Highest Utility.

WITH deep interest I have read THE FIREBRAND articles on Communism, and beg to contribute my mite toward the discussion.

As Anarchist-Communists it seems to me the only logical position we can take in defence of our doctrine is that it is the highest utility. There is plenty of room for sentiment, it is true. It is comparatively easy to show what mankind ought to be under a system of free Communism. We ought to be humane, just, honest, truthful. We ought to live as brethren, instead of like wild beasts. Crime ought to disappear; the incentive to commit in-

vasive acts ought to vanish; the idea of Commercialism, with all its follies and evils, ought to fade from men's minds; the social millennium ought to become a practical reality. But it is not so easy to show that these blessings would be ours. Yet, unless we can bring overwhelming evidence to our side of the case we cannot hope to make it win. I even take the extreme position that we should endeavor to show (and I believe it can be demonstrated) that outside of free Communism there can be no permanent welfare for humanity. Let us state the position thus: No system of society can be permanent in its benefits which does not recognize the dual principle—no master, no servant; each according to his needs. In view of what is already written, the minor premise and conclusion are understood.

Let us briefly look at the case as it stands. Would invasive authority disappear? The formula "no master, no servant" suggests the necessity of such a policy as would render invasive authority impossible. What that policy would ULTIMATELY be, who can tell? The abrogation of land titles, of laws upholding private ownership in the means of life, of laws supporting usury and monopoly; these measures resulting in the downfall of rent, interest and profit would give us a large measure of liberty and make it possible for human beings to abjure government.

Would crime and the incentive to commit invasive acts be annihilated? This question opens up a world of thought, and marks the dividing line between Commercialism and Communism. It is not enough to say, as do the Commercialists: Crime may continue, but we will restrain and if necessary punish the invader. CRIME SHOULD CEASE; the very word should become obsolete from disuse, and no system of radical change which contemplates less than this can survive. Communism, by abolishing ownership of private property (and the distinction between ownership and possession should be clearly borne in mind) would strike a decisive blow at crime. It has been shown that fully nine-tenths of the crimes enumerated in our statutes are direct offences against property. Of the other one-tenth fully one half are indirectly caused through private ownership in the means of life. Abolish private property therefore and nearly all crime will at once disappear; the incentive to commit this kind of acts will also vanish. Is not this a natural deduction?

It has been somewhere stated that man seeks to gratify his desires with the least possible exertion. This is equivalent to saying man is naturally a lazy animal, and I believe Emerson so stated. I deny the statement in both forms. It is true under the existing system, where labor is rewarded and honored in inverse ratio to its difficulty and unpleasantness. The ploughman seeks to become a clerk, not because his work is laborious or because he has a distaste for it; but because the clerk enjoys social advantages to which he is a stranger. What radical, among his or her acquaintances, has not taken mental notes of their fondness and adaptability for certain kinds of labor? I myself like to handle the tools and implements used in agricul-

ture! A woman comrade confesses to be fond of washing clothes! Take from labor its drudgery and dishonor, as would be under free Communism, and there would be few if any shirkers. Thus Communism proves of the highest utility as an economic factor.

"To each according to his needs! Why not? Why should Tom Jones receive more than Bill Brown? But the latter may be unskilled or a very lazy person! Perhaps so. But look at the bees, the ants, the four footed denizens of our trees. The drone has his uses; some ants are known to be less skillful and less strong than others; all squirrels are not equally industrious and provident. Under any other system than Communism what are to be done with our drones, our improvident weak and unskillful brethren? Ah! "science" steps in and declares the weakest must perish; the "fittest" must survive in order that natural selection and adaptation may produce a stronger race. But Communism, by caring for and equally rewarding all its members, in other words, by practicing mutual aid, would solve the problem of eliminating the weak in a far more humane, just and practical manner; thus rendering Communism of the highest utility as a preserver of species.

But it is a vast question, involving intricate inquiry into every phase of human motive and conduct. So far there has been no satisfactory measure of value or exchange given. None of us has "cock sure" where free will ends or necessitarianism begins. Few people can agree in their definition of value. Every argument tending to show the equity or utility of private property is in the last analysis shaky and unsatisfactory. Anarchy—freedom to do as we will at our own cost—is the great desideratum. Communism must come as a result of such freedom; the twin proving themselves the highest utility of human existence.

WM. HOLMES.

### Autocracy or Democracy?

A short time ago the Tsar crowned himself and was anointed as autocrat of all the Russias. He endeavored to make his coronation the most splendid and barbaric pageant of the century, and in doing so let his subjects know that he is the absolute power, the political vicar of God. As the Metropolitan Philaret at the coronation of Alexander I. said: "The anointing of the Tsar is no mere exhibition, no dead formula, but a sacramental act in which the visible and invisible are intimately combined, imbued with divine power, and the unction imparts God's blessing to his anointed." The Tsar then crowns himself, girds himself with his sword and seizes the sceptre with his own hand, to show his subjects that power is not vested in him by any earthly authority, but by the grace of God.

My intention is not to describe the ignorance and superstition of the Russian people in accepting their ruler as the representative of the will of heaven, but to show that their form of government is more consistent than that of the most "advanced" government—namely—the Social Democrats. The Russians, believing that they must have some one superior to



them to manage for them, accept government by divine right. But people with modern minds, who condemn government by divine right, and claim that there are no superior and inferior, that all are born free and therefore have equal rights, still desire government. Now when I say government I mean it in the full sense of the word: for it is stupid to say that the Social Democratic government would not govern. Every organ must have a function, and when you deprive an organ of its function the organ will disappear. The function of government, as everybody knows, is to govern. Take away its function and government will not exist.

Government by the majority means the oppression of the minority, and there is little, if any, difference whether governed by one or by many. To enact a law is to dissatisfy somebody; it is to impose the will of one upon others. Law is inconsistent with the declaration that all men are equal, for law, as Blackstone defines it, is "a rule of action prescribed by the superior which the inferior is bound to obey." And there is yet another difficulty. If you consider the people incapable of providing for their own interests, how then are they capable of choosing directors to guide them wisely? How else a government of geniuses by the votes of a mass of fools? As Carlyle said, of ten men nine are recognizable fools; how then will you ever get a ballot box to grind out wisdom from the votes of the ten? I tell you a million blockheads looking authoritatively into one man of what you call genius will make nothing but nonsense out of him if they look till the end of time.

I believe the arguments here produced are sufficient to prove the inconsistencies of those who advocate a representative government, and I also believe that every honest thinking man and woman will admit that there is very little difference between a government that is believed to have divine right to rule and one which itself is thought to be divine. Both rule and oppress, and to do good to all is to abolish every form of government.

E. GAMSON.

### It Is Bad.

Stephen T. Byington has an article in The Firebrand of May 3d, which might have emanated from an orthodox preacher, but could hardly have been written by any one who had read the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. He says I "charge Jesus with having said nothing upon subjects upon which he talked much and emphatically."

"Charge Jesus with having said nothing." That is just it. There is nothing in those collections of myths and legends known as the Gospels which mentions Jesus writing anything excepting one when he stooped down and wrote upon the ground. There is no record anywhere that Jesus told anybody to write anything. There is no record even in the writings of the "fathers" that anyone ever saw anyone who had heard of anyone who had seen anyone who had seen a manuscript written by an apostle or any immediate follower of Jesus. The Church has Jesus' coat, some fragments of the true cross and some milk of the Virgin Mary, but no one at any time ever had cheek enough to pretend that he had seen an autograph of an apostle. Jesus, if he ever lived, is no more responsible for those anonymous Gospels, written long after his time, in other countries than his, and in a different language from his, than he is for the nonsense of Moody and Ballington Booth. But millions of people accept the Gospels as history, and it is perfectly legitimate to discuss the Jesus of the Gospels as historical; just as some one has discussed the question if Hamlet was insane. This is a case where you do not have to catch your rabbit before you cook him.

What Jesus said ("much and emphatically") upon the money question was that a coin belonged to Caesar because it had his image and superscription upon it. That is the whole of his contribution to financial science. His entire contribution to the solution of the tariff question was to call off Levi, surnamed Matthew, from collecting revenue on the shore of Lake Galilee.

Now in regard to the case of Peter vs. Ananias. Brother Byington should know that a gift will not stand law. As he says, Ananias was under no obli-

gation to give anything, and he had a perfect right to change his mind and to rescind his gift, or a part of it, at any time. And to think of Peter sitting in judgment on him! If he had been struck dead for lying he would not have been there. But God does not strike people dead for lying, as is proved by the fact that somebody lived to write the Acts of the Apostles, and from the further fact that there is no God. If that thing happened as narrated, the probabilities are that Peter, or some of the Jerusalem group, poisoned Ananias and Sapphira. At any rate it was a case for a coroner's inquest, an autopsy and a grand jury.

The case is this: Ananias, while in good health and without any natural cause, suddenly drops dead. Some young men, lurking around by direction of a hard case by the name of Peter (a stone), wind him up and bury him without even waiting long enough for him to get cold. They do this secretly, not even notifying his wife of his death. Then Sapphira, his wife, comes in about three hours after. She also drops dead without any assignable cause and is also immediately buried with the most indecent haste. Some (probably all) of the money of the secretly buried people was found in Peter's possession and he claims it was a present. The theory of the defense is that an unknown entity, or nonentity, called Yevah, killed them for lying, because they pretended to have given all they had and only gave a part. That is no capital offense, but in such a case, where some people were going to clean them out of all they had, would be nearly justifiable. This God, if he did what they claimed, was guilty of murder. And here comes in the colossal, wicked, barbarous absurdity of the whole Christian theory. Their god is so powerful, wise, benevolent and good that he has a right to murder as many as he likes!

Decent people do not bury people stealthily as soon as they drop. Decent people in case of the death of a man in the community will notify his wife and allow her to attend the funeral. Decent people, when a man dies, especially when they are holding his money for him which they have rendered no equivalent, will give their comrade a decent burial. Yes, this case is decidedly bad for the apostles. When they extemporized funerals they should have conducted them "decently and in order", and not "blasphemously" charge God with a double murder.

D. PRIESTLEY.

### Theory and Practice.

In digesting the different writings and criticisms in THE FIREBRAND, I often think the efforts of the writers are mainly bent upon a discussion of the principles of Anarchy and its workings as they hope to see in the future. Now, while I would not wish to retard in the least degree humanity in the principles of a better system than any government can give us, it does seem to me, as to Comrade Bodendieck, that a few communes will give us practical hints and experiences that will tend to educate the average man and woman much faster than theory alone.

Two years ago I was a State Socialist, and their theories, to my mind, were right. I was one who helped to form a co-operative company in this (Washington) State on the principles advocated by Bellamy. I believe colonies founded upon State Socialism carry with them the seeds of dissolution in the power-wages of the various stockholders, directors and committees, with the usual by-laws that are always trying to regulate the actions of the other fellow, i. e., the minority; to say nothing of the petty squabbles that attend the election of the different superintendents, managers and officials commonly required to measure off the red tape commonly worn by a full fledged government, even though it be in miniature only.

It may be that Socialism will be the next step taken by the people. If so, Anarchists will be hastening their good time by aiding them; for I believe they will find Anarchy sooner through the democritizing of State Socialism than through the present dictatorship of King Grover the First. Many of the principles that I now deem right found lodgment with me through the daily life in the colony of which I was a member, and through the aid of both theory and practice, with others, I am applying them today in a commune at this place.

Comrade Addis has thoroughly outlined, in a recent number of THE FIREBRAND, the principles that we have here put in practice, i. e., perfect freedom for individ-

uals to work and adopt any system they may choose, either collectively or singly. We have passed through State Socialism and reached the plane of entire absence of authority in any sense of the word. We simply unite our labors as our better judgment tells us from day to day is best. No rule is adopted but what can be changed without begging some one high in authority for the privilege of doing so. However, should men and women come among us wishing to adopt the ideas of Socialism, they would be welcomed here and have all the liberty of perfecting their system to its highest state. All we would ask is to be left free to adopt any course we might deem best.

To free the natural opportunities and secure the freedom of the individual, with the conditions that surround us today, can hardly be accomplished by theory alone. The average man must have practical tests of a theory, and here Comrade Morris has the weak side when he says in his comment on Comrade Andrews' article: "They may, and many do, admit all your claims, but to them you are a dreamer, and they don't invest in dreams." When one puts his theories into practice and proves to humanity that they will accomplish all he claims for them, then the dream becomes reality. Men of means will then be found who will assist in perfecting the movement. Therefore let us unite theory and practice, and while we cannot expect to enjoy in a small commune what universal Anarchy would give, step by step we could feel our way and the result would be far more beneficial than to plunge headlong into a theory that the masses so little understand, and that through their ignorance would tend to establish some form of government instead.

The land with us is held in common, yet the individual can select and occupy his separately, or a group may hold collectively. All work co-operatively, though not compelled to do so. To one interested, though not obtaining a home where better conditions prevail, I would say we are making a success of it here and invite all to join us.

A. O. VERRY.

Lake Bay, Washington.

### Through State Socialism into Anarchism.

THE idea that we must of necessity pass through State Socialism in order to reach Anarchism is quite prevalent, especially among those who have recently broken their shell of reverence for the State and are still in the habit of thinking in the same channels as when they were eager advocates of "socializing" everything by law. To such an one it looks perfectly reasonable and natural to suppose that step by step all monopolies will become national or municipal properties, and that thus poverty will be eliminated, ignorance eradicated and a wiser generation thus remove the last legal barrier and usher in a condition of freedom—Anarchy.

Such a view of the oncoming events is not at all unreasonable when held by one whose trend of thought has ever been directed toward State action as the sole means of relief, but when the light of experience, the lessons of history, is turned on, grave doubts of the correctness of such a theory force themselves upon the student. To the natural thinker this view appears as a mere transitional mode of thought which will disappear with an increased understanding of the question in its various phases.

History teaches one lesson very clearly, a lesson of vast importance, but one which many seem strangely slow to learn. That lesson is this: Privileges are never willingly given up by their possessors. The king on his throne holds his place as supreme potentate until buried from power against his will. The dog-catcher on a city's streets forsakes his job and turns his attention to other pursuits as unwillingly, his protest being less because his power to protest and the emoluments of his office are less extensive. The office holder who became a candidate the first time under protest, and who declared he would not occupy the office longer than one term for anything, will go to the bottom of his "sack" in order to retain his position.

With this undeniable fact as our guide, let us see if State Socialism is a step toward Anarchism.

The State Socialist program, if carried out, would really increase the number of privileged persons, and these privileged persons would undoubtedly try to maintain their privileges. Thus inequalities of pow-



er and opportunity would be perpetuated and increased. The amount taken from the product of labor to provide for the privileged class from the president of the national executive committee, the central directing authority, down to "inspector of workshop, mine and home" would increase as the commissions and offices increased, and the proposition that "labor is entitled to all it creates" would be as empty as our present boast of "individual sovereignty".

Regimentation, dictation and constant espionage do not tend to make people free, self-reliant or noble. The degradation that would grow upon a people who would submit to such an arrangement would unfit them for freedom, and the constant surveillance of the masses by the privileged office-holding class would necessitate a violent and remorseless revolution in order to make freedom possible.

Not the road to Anarchy is not through State Socialism. We may be free only by breaking our bonds, not by substituting new and more numerous ones. The State, as a suppressor of crime and a protector of life, has been a sad failure, and to entrust it with the providing of employment and the dispensing of bread is equivalent to putting your purse in the care of one who has criminally or carelessly squandered your property.

The more the powers of the State are curtailed the more nearly we approach a condition of Anarchy: the more the powers of the State are increased the further we drift from it. How then can State Socialism, the governmentalization of everything, lead to Anarchy? It cannot.

If you really want Anarchy, refuse to uphold the State. Decline to run for or hold office. Refuse to do jury duty, and in every way practicable weaken the powers of the State.

HENRY ADDIS.

### Chicago's Brave Defenders.

From the Chicago "Fackel" we glean the following: Little Willie, the eight-year-old son of John Wipfler, of 42 Reese St., seeing other boys with guns on Decoration day, was bound to have one, too. Finding a red cloth in his mother's "rag-bag", he made a flag of it and fastened it to the fence, quite proud of his achievement. Pretty soon a blue-coat turned the corner and seeing the red flag was affected in such a way as to remind one of a vicious steer. In his eagerness to save the country he telephoned to the station that terrible things were about to happen, that an Anarchist riot was imminent, that the red flag was already hoisted. A wagon load of uniformed rowdies was sent to the scene ready for the fray. But when the situation was explained by Mrs. Wipfler they slunk away with drooping features.

### Socialistic Contradictions.

It is wonderful into how many absurd contradictions a man or a movement may be lured when once a desire to win in politics becomes the ruling passion. Unfortunately, the authoritarian would be Socialist cannot or will not see these contradictions. There are, however, many of them, and without further preface we will give consideration to a few of the more prominent.

Social Democracy, or Socialism that trusts in government, has no faith in reason, and is therefore illogical. It is fair to claim that if it were reasonable, or felt itself reasonable, it would be willing to trust to the force of logic only, and not be constantly appealing to the logic of force, either in the shape of a government soldier or a capitalist Pinkerton. But not a socialist government (a contradiction in terms) feels that it would need the ballot, the bayonet and the bullet, and that reason alone would be a trifle inconvenient.

Social Democracy is but discontented tyranny. Hear its supporters rave about majority rule and the necessity for compelling the minority to submit. Then take a look at Germany, where the majority, through the Kaiser, is laying down the law for the people, and observe how the Social Democratic minority has to submit. Their mouths and their papers are all filled with the utmost rebellion against a treatment which is the logical outcome of their very principle of majority compulsion. They say they believe in government: they get government and then they grumble. They do not wish to be governed; they wish to govern. They object to tyranny because it is against them and not by them.

Social Democracy is a malevolent benevolence. Its supporters tell the worker what good things they will do for him. He objects, thinking he can do better for himself. At once they wax indignant and in the name of his welfare would compel him to have what he considers illfare. They do not perceive the extraordinary contradiction there is in compelling sane people to have a thing whether good or not. The thing may be good, but there can be no doubt that the act of compulsion is never anything but evil. Surely these philanthropists are too good. We would advise them, if they are desirous of our everlasting gratitude, not to be too zealous; a very little malevolent benevolence will go a long way with us.

Social Democracy is the divine right to do wrong. Social Democrats think they can do no wrong in protecting that mystery, the community. You, they say, are but an individual and, therefore, nothing to them in comparison with that vast conglomeration, the community. If the community is suffering they would immediately endeavor to balance matters by making some unfortunate individual suffer also. In fact, the individuals separately will be called upon to suffer for the supposed welfare of the individuals collectively. In other words, everybody will have to make himself miserable in order to bring about the happiness of the rest. Here a puzzle arises, for when all are miserable where are the happy ones?

The Social Democracy is the ungovernable governor. Doubtless you have often spent an hour listening to these acute logicians. Notice the following. Man, they say, is an ignorant, stupid brute, who can by no means look after himself—has never been taught by others to do so. This applies to all men; for if it did not some could do these things themselves, and so, in their case, the truth of the anarchist position would have to be admitted. But it is impossible that they should admit this. They will tell you that all men are unable to govern themselves. No man, they repeat ad nauseum, can govern himself; therefore, they add with the fine sense of logic, let us elect him into parliament to govern others. Such a decision requires no comment.

Their actions are as contradictory as their logic. To-day they make use of the weapon that has forever been used by reformers, namely, the art of persuasion. But tomorrow they propose to abandon persuasion and resort to bloody, brutal force. Firstly, they will use that argument they can until they get their majority, and then, in that contradiction to their own development, they will endeavor to suppress the minority by militarism. To get the majority will be hard work; they will use the tongue; then to get the minority it ought not to be so hard, so accordingly they ought to go on with the voice and pen in a friendly, social manner. But no, they prefer to resort to the beneficent instruments of a William the Conqueror, or a Captain Kidd; they will prefer to make enemies of the minority by attempting to coerce them into good fellowship. Such good fellowship can be discovered any day in the gaol at Warrwood Scrubs, or within a hundred miles of Dartmoor.

These are the people who will get rid of monopoly by the use of the great monopoly of officialism. If one were to take at their supposed value the spluttering candles of Social Democracy one might suppose that monopoly would fade away before their luminous presence, as the hanging mists are dissipated by the rising sun. But, alas! the slightest investigation of the words used by most of the advocates of Social Democracy soon annihilates any hope born of their monotonous vapors and illimitable promises. They would take the world out of the tightening clutch of its ten thousand owners today, only to put it into the more deadly grip of seven hundred elected right men (who, be it remembered, are all picked out by the wrong ones—it being part of their plan for the "wrong ones" to pick out the "right ones"). Here they will hasten to inform you that this 700 are the people, regardless of the mathematical fact that, in these islands at any rate, 700 can by no stretch of the imagination be converted into 50,000,000. No, they say these men will be controlled by the vote regardless of the historical fact that it is men of position, wealth, power and privilege who control the vote—always have and always will so long as landlordism and money exist. No, they will exclaim, it is not these who will make the laws, but the people, regardless of the logical fact that the people cannot make laws, but are compelled to accept laws—a very different matter. To make a loaf and to accept a loaf are actions of a very different nature. The position, therefore, would remain much as before, except that the monopoly would be more

concentrated and to all who love liberty would be more unendurable than ever.

But there is one monopoly which I think no Social Democrat will have the temerity to say he does not believe in, and that is the monopoly of power and legislation. He wants all the power and all the legislation. No Tory need make the laws; Social Democracy will relieve him of all the cares of the State. No Anarchist may care for his own body; Social Democracy permits of no partitioning of legislation. Where now is the claim of Social Democracy that it will sweep away monopoly? Truly the Social Democrats are a spectacle to all who ponder critically over their words, their actions and their position.

The foregoing are but a few of the many absurdities thrown in the way of progress by the advocates of Social Democracy, and he who investigates them can hardly fail to repudiate them and hasten to adopt principles that will at least have the virtue of consistency. —(C. T. Quinn, in Liberty (London).

### A House Built on Sand.

WHEN we were children we said if we were men we would do so and so, and now that we are older and less natural children we say if we had power we would do so and so. Hence, the ballot box and this never-ending strife to rule anyone and everyone but ourselves.

We still carry the "mark of the beast", have not yet evolved from the animal kingdom. The biggest, the strongest and the cunningest lead the herd. But some day we shall discover a force vastly greater than might, and become human.

We may glorify our institutions and humbug ourselves to our hearts' content regarding the omnipotence of the ballot box, it is a false principle. We may apologize for it as the best known expedient, but by no sort of mental contortion can we twist an expedient into a true principle. Even the good we do build upon it has no sure foundation. The might of majority can never be right. It is destined, therefore, to certain oblivion.

We know the law and have known it for centuries, but have allowed it to remain suspended twixt heaven and earth. It is not "practical", we say. Infantile folly.

Individually we are free to "love one another", but collectively we are not. To do so we must organize, but we cannot organize Force (majority) to carry out the law of love any more than we can hate those we love. Oil and water will not mix.

Come, friends, let us be "practical"—let us be as practical as you please; let us build for all time. We are not looking for expedients just now.

SAM FOMOGRAF.

### Is Discipline Necessary?

I do not know that I am an Anarchist, or that I know yet exactly what an Anarchist is. However, I like this FRIEDERLAND quite well.

Now in my present political condition, I cannot clearly see how we would get along to banish all authority; I cannot see how discipline can be maintained, and I do not know how to co-operate without discipline. An army, to be disciplined, must obey the commanding officer. A coalition party, to act in harmony, must act with the caller. Now, as I understand it, no authority, or no discipline, Anarchy, would destroy the efficiency of the one and the harmony of the other, and all things similar in society would be similarly affected.

Still, I cannot see why we need to have officers to lavish wealth upon as a royalty, by paying, in many instances, ten to one hundred times as much as the same service would cost from the lowest responsible bidder. And if the cost is more than the service is worth, why have them at all? we had better be looking for a more economical system.

I am opposed to privileged laws, overpaid officials, professional services or an over abundance of either. I also recognize in our boasted Christian civilization that the government which stands the highest in acknowledged enlightenment has the most destructive and the greatest amount of death-dealing machinery, is the greatest robber, and is forever molesting smaller tribes which can be subjugated for purposes of taxation, or in plainer language, robbery. Why could not a man in Spain content himself to live on his own labor, and why will he pay so much to subdue the man in Cuba? Re-



cause he thinks to make it up by robbing him.

So also in our own land there are two classes—one holds the instrument of destruction and manipulates that unknown terror called government to their own aggrandizement, while the other, generally speaking, do not believe they have an equal right to bear dangerous weapons, fear and tremble at the thought of opposing government, and are willingly robbed.

Equal justice, impartial liberty, rights to all, privileges to none, wishes of, for and by the people would build a terror no honest person need fear. But when the people allow their hobby to go beyond control, and when it has them cornered and kicking the life out of them, and when they could upset him with the same weapons, and then through superstitious fear allow themselves to be destroyed first, they are unwise.

I believe might is authority, and that it is necessary for the oppressed to use equal weapons to counteract the effects of one-sided force, which causes slavery, robbery, starvation and degradation. I guess I am an Anarchist in the destructive, but I cannot understand the constructive.

JOSEPH PARROTT.

THERE is a vast difference between the discipline of an army and the harmony of the cotton. The one is compulsory, the other voluntary. The commanding officer has power to punish for disobedience; the caller in simply a prompter; he does not give orders nor has he the power of compelling any action. His position is not authoritative, neither is it necessary. The figures of the dance may be learned so that the party can go through it in perfect harmony without a prompter. But lest some should not be familiar with the different moves, the prompter holds his position by virtue of possessing the necessary knowledge. Should he manifest a lack of knowledge of the dance he would not be tolerated an instant. So, under Anarchy, the man who displayed superior knowledge and ability in any line of work would without doubt be looked to as director or prompter in that work. He would have no authority to command, but self-interest would prompt the following of his instructions. Thus, the director would never develop into a tyrant, as the foreman of a shop so universally does under the capitalist system. And efficiency would be increased instead of lessened, because the welfare of each depends upon the efficiency of all, and self-interest is the only promoter of efficiency. As to the military army, Anarchism has no use for it and does not consider it at all. For purposes of defense a voluntary association operating on the principle outlined above would be far more efficient than any military organization.

To the Anarchist it appears that the functions of government are not services (and therefore worth nothing), but are pernicious meddlings, and therefore worth much to be rid of. I cannot think of any real service the government of the United States has rendered the people, but I can tell what the people have paid for what the government has gratuitously assumed to be service—the price has been liberty. If it is assumed that so simple a thing as the law prohibiting theft is a service, it can be shown that not only is the law not a protection against theft, but that theft is the direct result of privilege created by law. Laws are of two classes—positive, or creative, and negative, or prohibitive. One creates privilege, while the other prohibits certain acts which would not be committed in the absence of privilege. When "privileged laws" are repealed the rest will be inoperative for want of subjects.

What our friend notices as characteristic of the most enlightened governments is perfectly natural—is but the logical result of the principle. The unenlightened government is crude in its methods; but with enlightenment comes greater acuteness and ability in applying the principle of exploitation. Did you ever hear of want and starvation amid abundance among a primitive people? No; only an enlightened government is capable of producing that anomaly. Nevertheless, the principle is the same—must be the same in all governments.

It is plain enough to most people that when taxation is imposed upon a tribe or nation justified for the purpose it is robbery. Is it any the less plainly a case of robbery when imposed upon the individual whom the accident of birth has placed within the "jurisdiction" of the government? But no govern-

ment can exist without assuming the right of taxation. Robbery is the first thing provided for in all political constitutions.

Might certainly does establish and maintain authority, and we see that robbery is the sole aim of authority. Now does our friend, who evidently still believes in a government "of, for and by the people" (whatever that may mean), want to rob instead of being robbed? If not, why does he want to exercise his might in that direction? Does not security lie in mutual agreement to abandon the struggle? We will not rob; we will not be robbed. We will struggle for protection, but not for subjugation. On this ground alone are we Anarchists.

J. H. M.

## Turner at Philadelphia.

LAST Saturday evening the Young Men's Liberal League at Philadelphia gave an elegant farewell entertainment to Comrade John Turner, of England, prior to his departure on his western tour.

Comrade Turner's two weeks stay in this city was a decided success. He addressed public meetings as follows:

Before Friendship Liberal League, on Sunday, May 24, at 2:30 o'clock p. m., on "Anarchy an Essential of Socialism"; and 7:30 p. m., on "The Evolution of Theology"; before the Ladies' Liberal League on Wednesday evening, May 27, on "The Growth of Anarchist Opinion"; Thursday evening, May 28, before the Single Tax Society, "Is the Single Tax Sufficient?" (a debate with Mr. Hetzel); before the Fellowship for Further Research, Friday evening, May 29, "The Government and Labor League, Saturday evening, May 30, "The Power of Capitalism"; and before the above-mentioned Young Men's Liberal League, Sunday evening, May 31, on "Modern Tendencies". He also addressed the Cigar Maker's Union.

Some Anarchist-Communist literature was sold at these meetings. The introduction of literature certainly ought to be considered an important object in a propaganda tour.

We have set out in an endeavor to raise our portion of the \$50 necessary to enlarge THE FIREBRAND so that it may have room for reports of Anarchist activity in all parts of the country. Then lecturing tours could be arranged much more easily and with much more certainty of success. I hope to see this soon. A. B.

## A Hundred Years Ago.

Here is an extract from a letter written from France in 1790 by Thomas Jefferson, quoted by Senator Tillman in his Denver speech, which you might like to print some time when you have room. D. P.

"The basis of free government being the opinion of the people, the very best object should be to keep that right; and were it left for me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without government I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter. But I should mean—mark you the condition—that every man who received those papers should be capable of reading them. I am convinced that those societies, as the Indians, which live without government, enjoy in their general mass an infinitely greater amount of happiness than those who live under the European government. In the former public opinion is in place of law, and restrains morals as powerfully as law ever did anywhere. Among the latter, under the pretense of government, they have divided their nations into two classes—wolves and sheep. I do not exaggerate; this is a true picture of Europe. To cherish, therefore, the spirit of our people, and keep alive their attention, do not be too severe upon their errors, but restrain them by enlightening them, for once they become inattentive to public affairs, you and I, congress and assemblies, judges and governors, shall become wolves. It seems to be the law of our general nature, in spite of individual exceptions, and experience declares that man is the only animal which devalues his own kind: for I can apply no milder term to the governments of Europe, and to the general praying of the rich on the poor."

Jefferson, though a supporter of the "free government," was as thorough an example of the Anarchist as the history of his time affords. There is no longer any doubt, though our histories are careful not to say so, that the government was the result of a compromise between the Monarchist party and the Democrats, i. e., those who advocated the "town meeting" as the only government. Jefferson and his party accepted the compromise as a bargain against Monarchy, but always depended upon public intelligence rather than the government. He knew that the establishment of the Republic did not settle the question of liberty. Many of his utterances show that to some extent he under-

stood and feared the machine that had been set up. He firmly believed that twenty years of its operation would be sufficient to make revolution necessary. J. H. M.

The Allegheny (Pa.) Workingmen's Educational Society is worthy of special commendation for its assistance to the Anarchist press. THE FIREBRAND has received from these comrades \$5 and \$10 on numerous occasions; in fact their contributions have not been less than \$5, and sometimes \$10, per month during this year. Other papers have also been benefitted by their zeal and activity. The "Freiheit" lately acknowledged their timely assistance when it was "in a hole." The raffle which they recently conducted for the benefit of THE FIREBRAND netted us, so far, \$22.50, and some tickets to hear from. In this latter work we are requested to say that the comrades in Drill, O., have the special thanks of the Allegheny group for assistance. This good work simply shows what can be done by those really interested in the cause. If other cities would do as well THE FIREBRAND would soon have a press and eight pages.

The printers of Vienna refused to set up articles in the capitalist press of that city misrepresenting and calumniating the socialistic party and the workmen. One of the sheets gave vent to its chagrin in the following note:

To our readers.—The typesetters of Vienna refused, at the command of the social democratic party leader, to set the reports incident to the first of May Parade as prepared by government officials. Under this pressure a days editorial is written, the original being rejected by the typesetters. Yes, it has come to this.

The Executive Committee branded the assertion that it had influenced the printers, as a lie. And we believe it. This resistance on their part did not originate with the "bosses," but with the workmen themselves. It was a sight for the gods if these mental prostitutes were compelled to set, print, fold and distribute their lies and calumnies themselves.—Der Socialist, Berlin.

## Receipts.

Workingmen's Educational Society, Allegheny, Pa., \$22.50. Uhlman, Chicago Debating Club 1, each \$3. Rudash, Hahn, Krieger, each \$1. Ruedelush, 75c. Marcus, Holcomb, Oliver, Sauer, Tierling, each 50c. Gore, Huart, Channart, each 25c. Parrott, Ballou, each 10c. Rabotnik, for subscriptions \$2.20. Fulton, 50c.

TO THE FRIENDS OF THE FIREBRAND.—For the benefit of this paper I will send ten dollars for mounting and preserving any sized bird, from a hummer to an Eagle, without skinning, to any one sending 25 cents to THE FIREBRAND and a self-addressed, stamped envelope to Ed. Gore, Warren, Minn. P. S.—After receiving it, if your conscience troubles you for receiving so much for so little you can remit something to the sender. E. G.

## FIREBRAND LIBRARY.

Bases of Anarchism; Historical, Philosophical and Economical, by Wm. Holmes	5c
God and the State, by Bakounin	5c
The Commune of Paris, by Kropotkin and An Anarchist on Anarchy, by Reclus, both in one	5c
The true aim of Anarchism, by E. Steine	5c
Revolutionary Government, by P. Kropotkin	5c
Anarchist-Communism, " "	5c
The Wage System, " "	5c
Expropriation, " "	5c
Anarchist Morality, " "	5c
A Dialogue, by L. S. Duvigneaud, on the Fundamentals in Reform, by W. H. Van Ornum	5c
A Talk about Anarchist-Communism, Malatesta	5c
Anarchy, " "	5c
Revolutionary Studies, " "	5c
Anarchy on Trial	5c
An Anarchist Manifesto	2c
A Sex Revolution, by Lois Waisbrocker	25c
Anything More, by Lord's	5c
Wants and Their Gratification; H. Addis	10c
A Secret and Confidential Address, by Gavroche	15c
Revolution, a lecture by S. H. Gordon	5c
Fundamentals in Reform, by W. H. Van Ornum	5c

## LIBERTY LIBRARY MONTHLY

E. H. FULTON PUBLISHER  
Columbus Junction, Iowa.  
SUBSCRIPTION 50 CTS. PER YEAR.  
WITH THE FIREBRAND, 80 CENTS A YEAR.